

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO BOX 1480 Alexandra, Vignos 22M3-1486 www.nappo.gov

				
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
			<u> </u>	

08/915,658

08/21/1997

JIGISH D TRIVEDI

MIO024PA

1803

7590

06/12/2003

KILLWORTH GOTTMAN HAGAN & SCHAEFF ONE DAYTON CENTRE SUITE 500 ONE SOUTH MAIN STREET DAYTON, OH 454022023 EXAMINER

PERALTA, GINETTE

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2814

DATE MAILED: 06/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		08/915,658 TRIVEDI, JIGISH D	
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Ginette Peralta	2814
The MAILING D Period for Reply	ATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
	UTORY PERIOD FOR REP	LY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MON	NTH(S) FROM
 Extensions of time may be availer SIX (6) MONTHS from the first of the period for reply specified. If NO period for reply is specified. Failure to reply within the set 	the mailing date of this communication. d above is less than thirty (30) days, a re ified above, the maximum statutory perio or extended period for reply will, by statu ice later than three months after the mail	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply eply within the statutory minimum of thirty (3	i0) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
	communication(s) filed on 21	1 March 2003 .	
2a)⊡ This action is F	INAL . 2b) □ ¬	This action is non-final.	
		wance except for formal matte er <i>Ex parte Quayl</i> e, 1935 C.D.	rs, prosecution as to the merits is 11, 453 O.G. 213.
<u> </u>	s/are pending in the application	on.	
	claim(s) <u>1-30</u> is/are withdraw		
5)	• • ——		
6)⊡ Claim(s) <u>31-41</u> i			
<u> </u>	is/are objected to.		
<u> </u>	are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.	
Application Papers		•	
9) The specification	is objected to by the Examir	ner.	
10) The drawing(s) file	led on is/are: a)□ acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.
Applicant may n	ot request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyand	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11) The proposed dra	awing correction filed on	is: a)□ approved b)□ disa	approved by the Examiner.
If approved, corr	ected drawings are required in r	reply to this Office action.	
12)☐ The oath or decla	aration is objected to by the E	Examiner.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C.	§§ 119 and 120		
13) Acknowledgmer	nt is made of a claim for forei	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a)□ All b)□ Son	ne * c)☐ None of:		
1. ☐ Certified of	copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.	
2.☐ Certified of	copies of the priority docume	nts have been received in App	lication No
applic	ation from the International E	iority documents have been re Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). st of the certified copies not rea	
14) Acknowledgment	is made of a claim for domes	stic priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(e) (to a provisional application).
	,	rovisional application has been stic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§	
Attachment(s)			
Notice of References Cite Notice of Draftsperson's P	d (PTO-892) atent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	·	nmary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)

6) Other:

Art Unit: 2814

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. Claims 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no disclosure in the specification or the drawings for the feature of an intermetallic compound separating the first refractory metal silicide from the second refractory metal silicide, in the disclosure there is only support for a local interconnect comprising a layer of metal, a layer of metal silicide and an intermetallic compound, but it is not specified where in the structure the intermetallic compound is located, thus there is no written support in the specification for "an intermetallic compound separating said first metal silicide from said second metal silicide". The limitation will not be given patentable weight in response to the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

Art Unit: 2814

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 31 to 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Okamoto (U.S. Pat. 4,910,578).

Okamoto teaches in Fig. 4D an interconnect comprising a composite structure comprising a first metal silicide 4, a second metal silicide 8, and an intermetallic compound 10 comprising metal from the first metal silicide and metal from the second metal silicide; wherein the first metal silicide may comprise titanium silicide (col. 4, l. 43) and the second metal silicide may comprise tungsten silicide (col. 6, l. 49-51), and the intermetallic compound 10 comprises titanium tungsten (TiW) (col. 6, l. 64-66).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 35 to 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto (U.S. Pat. 4,910,578) in view of Shepard (U.S. Pat. 5,227,333).

Okamoto teaches in Fig. 4D an interconnect comprising a composite structure comprising a first metal silicide 4, a second metal silicide 8, and an intermetallic compound 10 comprising metal from the first metal silicide and metal from the second

Art Unit: 2814

metal silicide; wherein the first metal silicide may comprise titanium silicide (col. 4, l. 43) and the second metal silicide may comprise tungsten silicide (col. 6, l. 49-51), and the intermetallic compound 10 comprises titanium tungsten (TiW) (col. 6, l. 64-66).

Okamoto teaches the claimed invention with the exception of showing a field effect transistor having a source, a drain and a gate, formed in the semiconductor layer.

However, Shepard shows a local interconnect for connecting source, drain or gate of a field effect transistor to another active area within a substrate assembly, the local interconnect comprises a composite structure that includes a plurality of metal silicide layers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to connect a source, drain or gate to another area within a substrate assembly as taught by Shepard with an interconnect with a composite structure as the one taught by Okamoto in order to obtain a reliable interconnect that provides a good electrical contact to silicon and does not further react with the device contact region.

Furthermore, memory arrays are well known to be LSI circuits as discussed in Okamoto.

Furthermore, regarding the limitation of "an intermetallic compound formed by a reaction between said first metal silicide and said second metal silicide", the "formed by " part of the limitation is not considered since the method of forming a device is not germane to the issue of patentability of the device itself. Therefore, this limitation has not been given patentable weight.

Art Unit: 2814

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 3/21/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument's are directed to the newly added feature of the intermetallic compound separating the first metal silicide from the second metal silicide, as noted above this limitation has been rejected by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as this limitation is neither taught in the specification nor shown in the drawings.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2814

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ginette Peralta whose telephone number is (703)305-7722. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:00 AM- 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (703)308-49188-4918. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)308-7722 for regular communications and (703)308-7724 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)308-0956.

GP June 9, 2003

SUE

TEGHILOLUGY CENTER 2017